

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed December 6, 2006. Claims 1-7, 9, 13, and 15-17 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

1. Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants greatly appreciate the Examiner's statement in the outstanding Office Action in which claims 1-5, 13, and 16 have been indicated as being allowable.

In that it is believed that every rejection has been overcome, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims that remains in the case is presently in condition for allowance.

2. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Laksin* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0068772).

Claim 8 is canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and therefore, the rejection to the claim is rendered moot. Applicants take this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claim in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate any of the canceled subject matter to the public.

3. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 6, 9-10, 12-14, and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Laksin* in view of *Souder* (U.S. Patent No. 4,156,626). Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Laksin* in view of *Souder* in further view of *Aoki* (U.S. Patent No. 5,743,946). Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Laksin* in view of *Souder* in further view of *Santo* (U.S. Patent No. 5,965,252). It is well-established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious based upon a combination of

references, the cited combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *In Re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988), and *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

a. **Claims 6 and 17**

As provided in independent claim 6, Applicants claim:

A method of microwave curing of ink for piezo drop-on-demand ink jet printing comprising:

a. providing an ink, said ink having a microwave absorber, molecules of material capable of undergoing a polymerization reaction under the influence of microwave radiation, and a thermal initiator, said absorber enhancing absorption of microwave radiation;

b. printing with said ink an image bearing pattern on a substrate; and

c. irradiating by microwave radiation said printed image bearing pattern such that said image bearing pattern is cured by heat generated by said microwave radiation.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 6 is allowable for at least the reason that *Laksin* in view of *Souder* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “a. providing an ink, said ink having a microwave absorber, molecules of material capable of undergoing a polymerization reaction under the influence of microwave radiation, and a thermal initiator, said absorber enhancing absorption of microwave radiation,” as recited and emphasized above in claim 6.

For example, the Office Action indicates that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. In the present response, claim 6 includes similar features as claim 1. Therefore, for similar reasons as claim 1, claim 6 should be allowable over the cited art.

As such, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination of *Laksin* in view of *Souder* has not been made. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 6 and claim 17, which depends there from, should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 7 and 15

As provided in independent claim 7, Applicants claim:

A method of printing on an optically reflective substrate by piezo-drop-on-demand ink jet printing comprising:

a. providing an ink, said ink having a microwave absorber, molecules of material capable of undergoing a polymerization reaction under the influence of microwave radiation, and a thermal initiator, said absorber enhancing absorption of microwave radiation;

b. printing with said ink an image bearing pattern on said optically reflecting substrate; and

c. irradiating by microwave radiation said printed image bearing pattern such that said image bearing pattern is cured by heat generated by said microwave radiation and said microwave radiation is not reflected by the substrate.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 7 is allowable for at least the reason that *Laksin* in view of *Souder* in further view of *Aoki* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “a. providing an ink, said ink having a microwave absorber, molecules of material capable of undergoing a polymerization reaction under the influence of microwave radiation, and a thermal initiator, said absorber enhancing absorption of microwave radiation,” as recited and emphasized above in claim 7.

For example, the Office Action indicates that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. In the present response, claim 7 includes similar features as claim 1. Therefore, for similar reasons as claim 1, claim 7 should be allowable over the cited art.

As such, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination of *Laksin* in view of *Souder* in further view of *Aoki* has not been made. Accordingly, the rejections of claim 7 and claim 15 which depends therefrom should be withdrawn.

c. Claims 9-12, 14, and 18


Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claim 9 (which depend from independent claim 1) is allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claim 9 contains all features of independent claim 1.

Claims 10-12, 14, and 18 are canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and therefore, the rejection to the claim is rendered moot. Applicants take this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate any of the canceled subject matter to the public.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283